

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-21 in light of the arguments herein.

In the Claims

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Farris *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,881,131). However, the Examiner has not applied the cited reference to all 21 claims. In particular, the Examiner has not applied the cited reference to claims 10, 11, or 13. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner explain how the cited reference may be applied to claims 10, 11, and 13, in order to fairly notify Applicants of the specific grounds for the rejection. In the meantime, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

The present invention relates to methods and systems for provisioning customized telecommunication circuits. Claims 1-12 are directed to methods of provisioning a customized circuit between at least two terminal points. Claims 13-21 are directed to methods of obtaining a provisioned circuit between at least two terminal points.

The cited reference, Farris *et al.*, does not relate to the provisioning of customized telecommunication circuits. Farris *et al.* relates to the provisioning of domain names, user names, customer network addresses, and electronic mail addresses. (Abstract, column 32, line 36 through column 36, line 42.) As explained in more detail below, Farris *et al.* does not show, describe, or suggest the features recited in the claims of the Application.

Claims 1-12 require “linking a plurality of network segments provided by a plurality of separate transport suppliers . . . to form a provisioned circuit between said at least two terminal points.” Farris *et al.* does not disclose linking a plurality of network segments to form a provisioned circuit between said at least two terminal points. Moreover, as the Examiner acknowledges, Farris *et al.* does not disclose linking a plurality of network segments provided by a plurality of separate transport suppliers. Farris *et al.*, therefore, lacks any teaching or suggestion of linking a plurality of network segments provided by a plurality of separate transport suppliers . . . to form a provisioned circuit between said at least two terminal points. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claims 1-12.

Similarly, claims 13-21 require “receiving at least one circuit option from said facilitator . . . , wherein each of said at least one circuit options comprises a plurality of network segments from separate transport suppliers.” Farris *et al.* does not disclose receiving at least one circuit option from a facilitator. Farris *et al.* also does not disclose receiving at least one circuit option that comprises a plurality of network segments from separate transport suppliers. Therefore, Farris *et al.* lacks any teaching or suggestion of receiving at least one circuit option from said facilitator . . . , wherein each of said at least one circuit options comprises a plurality of network segments from separate transport suppliers. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with respect to claims 13-21.

SUMMARY

The Applicants submit that the claims are patentable over the cited art.

Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner grant early allowance of these claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorneys for the Applicants via telephone if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,


Charles M. McMahon
Registration No. 44,926
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200